

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1 and 3-18 are pending, claims 1 and 11-14 having been amended herein.

Claim 1 was objected to for containing a minor informality.

Claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 11-13 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venalainen (US 5,634,368) in view of Ham.

Claims 4-6 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venalainen and Ham as applied to claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 11-13 and 18 and further in view of Wiedmann et al.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venalainen and Ham as applied to claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 11-13 and 18 and further in view of Chisum.

Claims 7 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venalainen and Ham as applied to claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 11-13 and 18 and further in view of Chartrand and Venalainen (US 5,186,038).

Claim Objection

Claim 1 was objected to for containing an informality. Specifically the Examiner objected to the limitation "a second structure" since a first structure was not recited. Accordingly claim 1 has been amended herein to remove the reference to the "second structure". Thus, the Examiner's objection should be overcome.

Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 11-13 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venalainen (US 5,634,368) in view of Ham.

Claims 4-6 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venalainen and Ham as applied to claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 11-13 and 18 and further in view of Wiedmann et al.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venalainen and Ham as applied to claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 11-13 and 18 and further in view of Chisum.

Claims 7 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Venalainen and Ham as applied to claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 11-13 and 18 and further in view of Chartrand and Venalainen (US 5,186,038).

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended herein to recite that:

said first arm part is connected to said articulation by a connection assembly including a plurality of spaced holes each of the holes corresponding to a selected angular position and ball means for receipt within said a selected one of said plurality of holes for locking said first arm in a selected angular position so that said first arm part can be moved to a plurality of selected angular positions and locked in a desired selected angular position; and

wherein said second arm part is connected to said first arm part by a connection assembly including a plurality of spaced holes each of the holes corresponding to a selected rotary position and ball means for receipt within said a selected one of said plurality of holes for locking said second arm part in a selected rotary position so that said second arm can be rotated with respect to said first arm and locked in a desired selected rotary position.

The ball and hole type connections of the type recited in amended claims 1 and 11 allow the selective position of the respective parts in selected, accurate, step-wise manner. Thus, the ball and hole connections enables the parts to be selectively placed in certain positions are known in advance. In this manner a plurality of different known selected positions may be achieved. It is submitted that none of the cited reference teach or suggest this type of ball and hole type locking arrangement and thus cannot be selectively and accurately positioned in the manner of the claimed invention.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments it is submitted that the Examiner's objections and rejections have been overcome and should be removed and the present application should now be in condition for allowance.

Should any changes to the claims and/or specification be deemed necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to discuss the same.

It is believed that this communication is being timely submitted. However, in the event that it is untimely and extension fees are required, this is to be considered a petition for extension and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any requisite fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0518.

A Notice of Appeal is being filed with the present amendment to maintain the application pending.

An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
STEINBERG & RASKIN, P.C.

By 

Paul J. Higgins
Reg. No. 44,152

Steinberg & Raskin, P.C.
1140 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(212) 768-3800